Information Technology Investment Board

DRAFT

MINUTES
Strategic Planning and Review Committee

Thursday, February 9, 2006
Virginia Information Technologies Agency (VITA) Auditorium
110 South Seventh Street, Richmond, VA

Attendance

Members Present:
The Honorable Aneesh Chopra
Kenneth S. Johnson, Sr.
Walter J. Kucharski
Leonard M. Pomata, Chair
Alexander "Sandy" Thomas

Member Absent:
James W. Hazel
Mary Guy Miller, Ph.D.

Others Present:
Lemuel C. Stewart, Jr., Chief Information Officer of the Commonwealth
Jerry Simonoff, VITA Strategic Management Services Director
Dan Ziomek, VITA Associate Director for Project Management
Paul Lubic, VITA Associate Director for Policy, Practice and Architecture
Mike Sandridge, VITA Project Management Division

Call to Order

Mr. Pomata called the Strategic Planning and Review Committee meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.   Following a roll call, Mr. Pomata reported that a quorum of the members was not present; however, other members were expected to arrive later.   Mr. Pomata announced that action on the minutes would be deferred until a quorum could be present.

Commonwealth Information Technology Strategic Plan

Mr. Paul Lubic, Associate Director for Policy, Practice and Architecture, gave a status report on development of the *Commonwealth Information Technology Strategic Plan*.   He reported on results of the two-day IT strategic planning retreat held in January. Participants at the retreat were members of the IT Investment Board, both the outgoing and incoming Secretary of Technology, the Executive Director of the Council on Virginia's Future (CVF),

representatives of stakeholder groups, and VITA management. Prior to the retreat, 16 workshops were held involving 130 participants from various stakeholder groups.

Mr. Lubic reported that the project team had been working with the Department of Planning and Budget and the Executive Director of the Council on Virginia's Future to make sure the IT strategic plan would fit with the existing Commonwealth of Virginia strategic planning cycle and that it aligned with Virginia's long term objectives.

Mr. Lubic discussed VITA's relationship with the Council on Virginia's Future. He noted that both entities have a mandate to improve Virginia's future from an enterprise point of view. He explained the makeup of the Council, noting that it is chaired by the Governor. He advised that the Council had used information from VITA's enterprise business architecture, and that they were also interested in using the stakeholder information recently gathered. Mr. Lubic reported that the Council has expressed an interest in joining the IT Investment Board in a one-day session to foster interaction and understanding between the two groups.

Mr. Lubic then briefed Committee members on the results of the planning retreat—the mission, the vision, goals, objectives and initiatives that were developed.

Mr. Lubic advised that the IT Strategic Planning Workgroup is meeting weekly to continue to adjust and prepare the draft Plan for submission to the IT Investment Board on or before March 31, for action at the Board's April meeting. He explained that it was important for the Board to release the IT strategic plan this spring to provide direction to state agencies in the preparation of their IT strategic plans.   He noted that the Council on Virginia's Future business strategic plan was under development and would not be released until July 1. He discussed the importance of the business strategic plan to the IT strategic plan, and because of that importance, the need to review the IT strategic plan in the fall to take into account the business strategic plan.   Discussion followed.

Mr. Kucharski expressed concern that the goals and objectives presented did not align with the IT Investment Board's *Code* responsibilities, and requested that staff submit a crosswalk of how they relate.

Mr. Kucharski expressed his concern that agency heads did not yet have a clear understanding of the impact of the IT transformation.   Mr. Stewart acknowledged that a significant communications effort needed to take place. He advised that there would be an agency heads meeting on February 16 and one of the purposes of the meeting would be to help prepare our customers for the transformation ahead. The agency heads meetings may be held quarterly. Discussion followed.

Mr. Pomata asked how soon the Board members could see a draft of the plan. In response to a question from Mr. Pomata, Mr. Lubic advised that each time the workgroup meets, a new draft of the plan is completed and that could be sent to the Board/committee members for feedback. Mr. Pomata requested that both the crosswalk of the IT strategic plan and Board and VITA *Code* requirements and the latest draft of the IT strategic plan be provided to the members by March 1.

Mr. Simonoff noted that in September, each state agency is required to submit to the Department of Planning and Budget an "agency" strategic plan.   The *Code* requires the *Commonwealth Information Technology Strategic Plan*, to which VITA and other agencies would be subject. Discussion followed.

STAFF ACTION: By March 1, prepare and submit to the Committee (1) a crosswalk of the goals for the Commonwealth IT Strategic Plan and the IT

Investment Board and VITA's <u>Code</u> responsibilities; and (2) the latest Strategic Planning Workgroup draft of the IT Strategic Plan for their feedback.

Major IT Projects Status Report

Mr. George Williams, Project Management Division, gave a status report on major information technology projects. He briefed committee members on changes that had been made in the report since December and noted that there were 21 active projects in the current report.   He explained in the CIO assessment that one project had been rated Red—the State Board of Elections' Virginia Election and Registration Information System—and six projects had been rated Yellow. Discussion followed on the projects and the report.

Mr. Williams informed Committee members that there were two project related activities deserving recognition—the Department of Emergency Management's Occupancy of the new Emergency Operations Center; and higher education's collaboration on the Banner and eVA interface and Banner training.

In response to a question from Mr. Pomata, Mr. Williams advised that he felt the Major IT Projects Status Report was a little "greener" compared to last year. Discussion followed. Mr. Pomata asked that the Committee be provided with a trend analysis on the report at the end of each fiscal year.

STAFF ACTION: Staff will provide, at the end of each fiscal year, a trend analysis of the change in project ratings on the Major IT Projects Status Report.

Quorum Recognized

Mr. Pomata announced that with the arrival of additional Committee members, a quorum was now present.

Recommended Technology Investment Projects (RTIP) Report

Ms. Constance Scott, Project Management Division, reported on the results of a follow-up survey recently conducted on the 2005 RTIP report.   She explained that the purpose of the survey was to find out who is using the report; how the report is being used; whether or not it meets the expected needs of identified stakeholder groups; and, to obtain suggested improvements to the report and process. Ms. Scott reviewed the list of targeted stakeholder groups who received the survey.

Ms. Scott advised that the survey had received a low response rate of 13 percent. She then briefed Committee members on the information obtained from the survey responses. She noted that the lack of response to the survey may indicate that the report is not being used by many people, and that the report is complex, difficult to use, and in some cases misunderstood. Ms. Scott recommended that the 2006 RTIP report be simple, easy to understand and use, and that outreach and education about the report and related processes for strategic planning need to be improved. Discussion followed on what should be included in the 2006 RTIP report, the format of the report, and the intended target audience.

Mr. Kucharski questioned how $30 million in contract funds was included in the Governor's Budget for the PPEA Enterprise Applications effort, when the project was not included in the 2005 RTIP report as a priority project. Discussion followed on how the Governor sets budget priorities. Mr .Kurcharski stated that a crosswalk needed to be done between the

Code, JLARC's Report - *Overview: Review of Information Technology in Virginia State Government*, and the RTIP Report to make sure the recommendations regarding the RTIP Report were met.

Mr. Stewart acknowledged that the PPEA process had been a learning experience and that the project had only been approved for preplanning and therefore was not recommended for funding in the report. Mr. Simonoff brought up the problem of timing since the report is due to the Governor and General Assembly by September 1.   Discussion followed on how to address PPEA efforts and should they be included in the report.

Mr. Pomata requested staff to create a one page draft outline of the proposed 2006 RTIP report and distribute to Committee members within the next 10 days.

STAFF ACTION: Within the next 10 days, prepare and submit to the Committee a one-page 2006 RTIP Report Outline which incorporates the Committee's discussion points, and a crosswalk of the RTIP report contents with respect to the intent of JLARC's 1997 report—Overview: Review of Information Technology in Virginia State Government.

Auditor of Public Accounts Presentation

Ms. Karen Helderman, Director of Information Systems Development for the Auditor of Public Accounts (APA), gave a presentation on the purpose of the APA and the work of two specialty teams—Information Systems Development and Information Systems Security. She advised that the APA is the independent auditor serving the Commonwealth of Virginia that is responsible for conducting audits of all state agencies, institutions, boards, commissions, officers, or other agencies handling state funds. The APA is elected by the General Assembly and serves under the legislative branch of government.

Ms. Helderman advised that the APA is organized by specialty areas, such as financial management, systems development, and systems security, and she discussed the different types of audits conducted. Audit reports are distributed to the legislature and executive management as deemed appropriate for the report topic, and all reports are available on their web site.

Ms. Helderman then gave an overview of the Systems Development audit team. She advised that all potential projects are tracked in a database for monitoring. She reported that they were currently auditing the Project Management Division to see whether VITA is meeting their legislative intent—using JLARC's 1997 report, *Overview: Information Technology in Virginia State Government* as a reference. The audit report should be issued sometime in March.

Ms. Kristin Anliker, Director of Information Systems Security for the APA, gave an overview of the Systems Security audit team. She discussed the three types of audits performed by the team—financial systems; compliance audits with Commonwealth IT standards; and special studies on information technology. The team also performs security reviews. Most of the results of their reviews are reported in the annual audit of an agency. Ms. Anliker reported that at the end of fiscal year 2006, the APA will issue a combined report on the Security of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Kucharski demonstrated the *Commonwealth Data Point*—a comprehensive database of the Commonwealth's financial transactions and demographics which can be accessed from the APA web site.

Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Pomata called for approval of the minutes of the December 8, 2005, Committee meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Thomas that the minutes of the December 8, 2005, meeting of the Strategic Planning and Review Committee be approved as written. Seconded by Mr. Johnson, the motion carried unanimously.

Other Business

Mr. Johnson reported that he had met with a group of IT vendors on minority participation in the Northrup Grumman (NG) contract.   He expressed his concern that there were no SWAM quota requirements in the contract. Mr. Simonoff advised that VITA's contract with NG did contain a number of SWAM requirements but no numeric quotas, as the Attorney General's Office had advised that such quotas were not allowable in Virginia. Mr. Pomata asked that the Committee be given a report on NG's SWAM participation efforts at their next meeting.

STAFF ACTION: VITA staff will report at the next Committee meeting on Northrup Grumman's SWAM participation efforts.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:53 a.m.